IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

C.O.C.P. No. 1150 of 2004.
Date of Decision: October 24, 2006.

Nahar Singh

....**Petitioner**

through
Mr. Aashish Chopra, Advocate

Versus

Harjit Singh & Ors.

...**Respondents**
through

Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.
Mr. G.S.Cheema, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

SURYA KANT,J.(ORAL)

After hearing learned counsel for the parties at length and going through the order dated 5.5.2004 passed by respondent No.1 which, *prima facie*, runs contrary to the spirit of interim order passed by this Court, this petition is disposed of with a direction that the order dated 5.5.2004 vide which mutation has been sanctioned in favour of respondents No. 2 to 4, shall remain in abeyance and no advantage whatsoever shall be taken by respondents No. 2 to 4 out of the said order till RSA No.3286 of 2003 is decided by this Court. It is further made clear that within one month from today, a “note” shall be incorporated in the revenue record (even if respondent No.1 is not presently posted as Collector, Gurdaspur), to the

aforesaid effect, and it would be the sole responsibility of Respondent No.1 to make an appropriate `reference' to the present Collector at Gurdaspur and get the needful done. If respondent No.1 fails in complying with the order passed herein above, the petitioner shall be at liberty to get these proceedings revived.

With these directions and observations, this petition is disposed of.

Rule discharged.

October 24, 2006. **(SURYA KANT)**
dinesh **JUDGE**